DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 393 SO 024 851

AUTHOR Kang, Sunjoo
TITLE An Analysis of the Historical Thinking of Middle-School Students, and Its Implications for Source Material Studies.
PUB DATE May 94
NOTE 32p.; Summary of M.E. Thesis, Indiana University. Paper presented at the Korean National History Symposium (May 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Research; Curriculum; *Curriculum Research; Educational Research; *Historiography; History; History Instruction; Intermediate Grades; Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; *Primary Sources; Research Tools; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Middle School Students

ABSTRACT

This summary of a Master's thesis focuses on research conducted with students in analyzing primary source materials translated from Korean. The document's sections are entitled: (1) "Explanation of the Research"; (2) "Types of Historical Thinking"; (3) "Implications for Source Materials Studies"; (3) "Bibliography (in English)"; (4) "Bibliography (in Korean)"; and (5) "Appendix (Text)." This study involved the use of a text, composed of seven documents and five questions, to survey students' historical thinking and to analyze what is needed for improvement. A total of 199 students were test in March 1993, with 102 of them sophomores in 2 classes and 97 juniors from 2 classes. The students had to solve the problems within 45-50 minutes. The questions the students were to answer involved the evaluation of the credibility of the documents and inference from the content of the documents. Analyses of the responses are given, along with implications for teaching and learning. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 393

An Analysis of The Historical Thinking of Middle-School Students, and Its Implications for Source Material Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SUNJOO KANG
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sunjoo Kang
Evermann Apts #353
Indiana University
Bloomington IN 47406.
TEL: 812-857-6544

cf. This paper is a summary of my M.E. Thesis. This paper was read in the Korean National History Symposium (May, 1994).

SO 024 851

Contents

Explanation of the Research

- Explanation of Survey
- Explanation of the Text Used

  Questions for Document Evaluation

  Questions for Document Inference

Types of Historical Thinking

- Types of Document Evaluation
- Types of Document Inference

Implications for Source Material Studies

- Problems of Students' Historical Thinking
- Implications for Teaching

Bibliography (in English)

Bibliography (in Korean)

Appendix : Text

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Our knowledge of the past depends, for the most part, on records. However, most records which have come down to us are not only fragmentary and selective but also biased and partial (Commager, 1967, p.5). In spite of the nature of those records, most people are inclined to believe what is written - "It was in the paper" or "The book says so"(Edwards, 1972, p.207). Therefore, if we intend to understand "what happened" and "what that means" through records which are related to past or present, we might identify how the records are written; how we know. Essentially the point is that unless we understand the "know" upon which the factual accounts we gain knowledge are based, we lack the "right" to be sure about them and cannot, strictly, claim to know anything (Rogers, 1987, p.31). In History, the students will ask and answer similar kinds of questions of source to those habitually postulated by historians. They might begin with "what does this tell us" or "how do we know" through a variety of questions about the evidence and the conclusions that can be drawn from it (Nicolas and Thompson, 1972, p.231). Ultimately it might lead to an analysis of the evidence in hypothetical terms and conclusions based on a penetrating examination of a number of sources on the same topic.

The need for introducing source materials and the manner of introducing them in History class have been debated. Recently, Source Material Studies have been introduced as a teaching method for encouraging students' activities(Blyth, 1982, p.126; Nicolas and Thompson, 1972, p.229). However, Source Material Studies should be emphasized not only for encouraging students' activities but also for improving their historical thinking - that is, it is concerned with producing true statements, and recognizing how we know about a particular aspect of experience.

In order to stimulate this kind of historical thinking, Source Material Studies should be designed based on a proper adaptation of historiography. Most previous research of Source Material Studies, however, has focused on how to introduce the historical mode of inquiry. It scarcely has considered characteristics of students' historical thinking.

Although some research about students' historical thinking has been undertaken, the research does not seem to be sufficient. Therefore, this paper attempts to identify some characteristics of students' historical thinking and to analyze what is needed for improving students' historical thinking. For this study, I prepared a text, which is composed of seven documents and five questions, to survey students' historical thinking, and tested them. As a result of testing, this paper divides the types of students' historical thinking and identifies some characteristics of the types. In particular, this paper focuses on what problems prevent students from understanding source materials. These findings can be a basis for designing Source Materials Studies.

To explore this topic, the first section explains the research method such as the students tested, testing method and text used. The second section identifies the types of students' historical thinking. The third section analyzes the problems that prevented students from understanding the source materials and suggests some ideas for teaching.

EXPLANATION OF THE RESEARCH

Explanation of Survey

The primary method used for this study was a questionnaire in which students read documents and wrote their answers to the questions in the text which I prepared. For this study, 102

sophomores from two classes and 97 juniors from two classes (total 199 students) were tested in March 1993. The students had to solve the problems within approximately 45-50 minutes. All of the students who were tested for this study were able to read and write.

The documents used in the text were selected from several materials concerning the *"Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun* in 1884," which was a political event in Korean history. The questions of this study were based on a specific analysis of two aspects of historical thinking: 1) The evaluation of the credibility of the documents (Questions-1, 2 and 3). and 2) inference from the contents of the documents (Questions-4 and 5).

Explanation of The Text Used

The documents and the questions are explained and presented below. In the text used for testing students, five questions were presented after seven documents. To give an outline of the event to the students who did not learn the event, at the beginning of the text a summery of the event was presented.

Introduction

The following documents are related to the *Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun*. This event took place from December 4 to 6, in 1884. *"Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun"* was the event whereby the members of the "*Kae-Hwa Party*," including *Kim Ok-kyun, Pak Young-hyo, Hong Young-sik* attempted to take power by taking advantage of the opening ceremony of the Korean Ministry of Communication. They attacked the Korean king's palace accompanied by 50 Korean military cadets and 200 Japanese solders. They escorted the king and the queen from the palace. They killed some government officials who supported the queen's followers. The *Kae-Hwa Party*, which took power, organized a new cabinet. They presented the reform bill composed of 14 clauses. However, the Chinese troops moved in and intervened. Therefore, some *Kae-Hwa Party* members, such as *Kim Ok-kyun and Pak Young-hyo*, had

to seek asylum in Japan. Other members of the Party were punished with death. The attempt ended in failure.

Questions for Document Evaluation

Questions-1, 2 and 3 were presented in order to identify what types of ideas students would use for evaluating the credibility of documents. The evaluation of the credibility of documents means that students decide how much of the document is available as historical evidence. That is, to examine if writers recorded untruthful or misleading facts, and if they expressed the historical events partially or exaggeratedly (Cha, 1988, p.79). If students begin to assume inaccurate ideas for evaluating the credibility of documents, they may select irrelevant information from documents, and may draw fallacious conclusions. Therefore, there are necessary questions to be asked as a matter of routine. "Is a document what it pretends to be?," "Is it complete?," "Was the writer present at the events he describes?," "If he was not, where did he get his information?," "Is there corroborative evidence?," " Was he an interested party?," and so on (Edwards, 1972, p.207).

In Question-1, the students were supposed to evaluate the credibility of one primary source (Document-1), which was excerpted from *Secret Documents: The Materials Concerned with Korea*, published in Japan in 1936. Document-1 contains a portion of conversation between *Pak Young-hyo* and a Japanese chief clerk. *Pak* was one of the agents of the event.

Document-1: This was excerpted from *Pak Young-hyo*'s conversation with a Japanese chief clerk on November 4, 1884.

"...I said to the king, 'The danger is near. If we do not declare independence of *Chosun* (traditional Korea), or if we do not change our political systems, it is easy to predict that our

country will be a colony of the other countries.' However, the Conservative Party is a majority whereas my party is a minority. On the one hand, the king partially believes us. On the other hand, he would not believe us. The queen mainly follows the opinion of the Conservative Party. She urges the king to believe the Conservative Party. The king is changing his mind gradually, and so would not listen to our patriotic advice."

Question-1: Do you believe whether *Pak* told the truth or not in Document-1? Choose your answer among the following, and write in detail why you believe so.

a) He told the truth.

b) He did not tell the truth.

c) It can not be judged whether he told the truth or not. Further documentation is needed.

In Question-2, the students were supposed to evaluate the credibility of two primary sources (Documents-2 and 3), which have contradictory explanations of the same situation. Document-2 was excerpted from *Kap-Shin Diary*, which was written about *Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun* by *Kim Ok-kyun*, several years after the event. *Kim* was a major agent of the event. Document-3 was excerpted from *Documents of Moellendorff* published in 1930. *Moellendorff*, who was recommended by China, was a diplomatic adviser to the Korean government in the period of the event.

Document-2: This was excerpted from *Kap-Shin Diary* written by *Kim Ok-kyun*, several years after seeking asylum in Japan. It was written about what happened on December 4, 1884.

"I said to the king, 'If we ask the Japanese troops to guard us, we can be safe.' The king told me to ask the Japanese troops. However, the king told me, 'If we ask the Japanese troops to guard, how will the Chinese troops respond ?' I answered, 'It will be better that we also ask the Chinese troops to guard us.' I said to *Yun Sae-hyun*, 'If you go to the Japanese legation, and bring the Japanese officer to the palace, you can gain credit. I also sent someone to the Chinese camp to ask them to come and to guard us (Of course, it was a lie. I have already conspired with him). I said to the king, 'In spite of asking the Japanese

troops, I think they would not come here, unless you write a letter to ask the troops.' The king said to me, 'What should I do?' I gave the king a pencil, and *Pak* gave the king a paper. Then, the king wrote on the paper by himself, 'Japanese minister! Come and guard me.'"

Document-3: This was excerpted from the Diary of *Mrs. Moellendorff* in <u>*The Documents of Moellendorff*</u> edited by *Mrs. Moellendorff* in 1930. *Moellendorff* was a diplomatic adviser who was recommended by China, in the period of the event.
"The rebels ran to and told the king that someone had raised a rebellion. Therefore, the king should hide himself, and ask the Japanese troops to guard him. The king rejected their advice. The rebels sent a letter which *Kim Ok-kyun* wrote 'Japanese minister! Come and guard me' to the Japanese legation."

Question-2: Document-2 and Document-3 are descriptions about the situation of the event. Answer Question-I and Question-II.

I. Are there any differences between the description of *Kim* (Document-2) and that of *Mrs. Moellendorff* (Document-3)? If any, what are the differences? Why do you think they exist?

II. If you want to understand the situation precisely, which document is more credible, in your opinion, to understand the situation? Select your answer among the following, and write in detail why you think so.

a) Document-2 is more credible than Document-3.
b) Document-3 is more credible than Document-2.
c) Both documents are credible.
d) Neither document is credible.
e) In order to judge which is more credible, further documentation is needed.

In Question-3, the students were suppose luate the credibility of one primary source and one secondary source (Documents-4 and 5). Document-4 contains several clauses of the reform bill that was prepared by the agents. It was also excerpted from <u>*Kap-Shin Diary*</u>. Document-5 is an interpretation of Document-4. It was written by a historian.

Document-4: This was excerpted from the reform bill which is contained in <u>*Kap-Shin Diary*</u>, which was written by *Kim Ok-kyun*, several years after the event.

Clause 1: We shall not pay tribute to China any more.

Clause 2: We shall repeal the caste system and establish the new law for the right of equal people. We enlist government officials based on their merits.

Clause 3: We shall reform land and tax laws, and force villainous retainers out. We shall help poor people, and save the money for the national finance.

Clause 12: The Minister of Finance only has the right of managing the national finance. The other Offices of Finance will be abolished.

Document-5: This was excerpted from a book related to *Kap-Shin- Chung-Byun* written by a historian in 1973.

"Clause-1 indicates the ideals of the *Kae-Hwa Party* to cut the traditional ties with China, and their argument for independence. Clause-2 indicates their belief that only when the *Yang-Ban* system (the traditional Korean caste system) was abolished, could the country prosper. One of their ideals was to establish a modern nation-state. Clause-3 indicates their intention to reform the land system and tax system which had been serious problems for a long time. Clause- 12 may be included in the reform bill, because their advice concerning the Offices of Finance being united together had not been approved. This clause indicates that the idea of the *Kae-Hwa Party* was the same that of the other Korean enlightenment leaders who wanted to create a rich and strong country."

Question-3: Document-4 and Document-5 are related to the reform bill. Answer Question-I and Question-II.

I. Are there any differences between Document-5 and Document-6? If any, what are the differences, and why do you think they exist?

II. If you want to understand precisely what reform the agents intended to pursue, which document is more credible? Select your answer from the following, and write in detail why you think so.

a) Document-4 is more credible than Document-5.

b) Document-5 is more credible than Document-4.

c) Both documents are credible.

d) Neither document is credible.

e) In order to judge which is more credible, further documentation is needed.

Questions for Document Inference

What is likely in the particular situation involves historical reasoning, reasoning within the limits of possibility given the particular personalities, circumstances and resources involved (Edward, 1972, p.211). In this context, we can present to the students two kinds of questions: 1) How would you handle the same situation? 2) How would people, who lived like this and thought in this way, handle the situation (Edwards, 1972, p.211)? The inference from documents in this study was mainly concerned with the latter question. The questions required the students to explain agents' view of how the agents acted and what their intentions were as they did so. If students use irrelevant documents to infer, or if they only partly understand the contents of documents, they may have a distorted view of what is likely to have happened in the past. Question-4 and 5 were presented to identify how students would use the documents for inference.

In Question-4, the students were supposed to infer what *Kim Ok-kyun* intended when they brought about the event from Documents-6 and 7. Document-6 was also excerpted from <u>*Secret Documents: The Materials Concerned With Korea.*</u> Document-7 was excepted from <u>*Reminiscence of Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun*</u> written by *Seo Jae-pil*, one of the agents of the event. In this question, the students were required to use the limited documents - Document-6 and Document-7.

Document-6: This was excerpted from Kim *Ok-kyun*'s argument, which was from a conversation between *Kim Ok-kyun* and the king on October 12, 1884.

"There are too many problems in our government. There are too many villainous retainers who keep the king blind. Only those who offer a bribe to China can take power. Therefore,

it follows that changes should be urgently made. First, we should reform the domestic systems to create a strong nation. Second, we should declare the independence of our country. Third, we should receive new knowledge from the other modern nation- states."

Document-7: This was excerpted from *Reminiscence of Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun*, written by *Seo Jae-pil*, who participated in the event as a military cadet.

"*Kim Ok-kyun* could not stand the humiliation of China's intervention in the sovereignty over his country. He always worried about how his country could be independent among countries. He had never received modern Western-style education. However, he understood modern policies and foreign affairs. He wanted to make his country be a strong modern nation-state. Therefore, he concluded that his country should introduce new knowledge and technology of Western countries. He also concluded that his country should abolish old conventions inherited by government and society. He understood that it took several hundred years for European countries to be enlightened because they had to compete with each other. However, he thought that it did not take too much time for Japan to be enlightened. Therefore, he thought the Japanese case could be a model for Korean reform."

Question-4: What were the intentions of *Kim Ok-kyun* to bring about the event in Document-6 and Document-7?

In Question-5, the students were supposed to infer what means the agents used to bring about the event, and why the agents used the particular means from all of the given documents. In this question, the students have to select the documents relevant to the question and causally infer from them.

Question-5: What kind of means did *Kim Ok-kyun* and *Pak Young-hyo* use for accomplishing their intentions in the event, and why did they use those means? Answer the question by using all of the documents presented (from Document-1 to 7).

TYPES OF HISTORICAL THINKING

This section is concerned with the types of students' historical thinking. First, the types concerning the evaluation of the documents are examined. Second, the types concerning inference from the documents are examined.

Types of Document Evaluation

This paper divides the students' answers concerning the evaluation into three types according to the references to which their answers implied. We can identify students' concepts about the documents evaluation according to the references they used. The characteristics and examples of each type are as follows.

1) Type-1: This type of student answered by reference to arbitrary interpretation without carefully examining the given information about the documents. Their interpretations were not reasonable. For example, a student answered Question-2 as follows, "Document-3 is more credible than Document-2, because Document-3 gave me information about the background and the situation of that time." The important clues to solve the problems for the students who answered this Type-1 were concerned with simple doubts, such as "what is easier?," "what is more understandable?," "what provided a more detailed explanation?" or "what is the simplest?" The examples were as follows: "Because it has more details, it is more credible" or "Because it is more understandable, it is more credible." However, this kind of reference is not available for evaluating the credibility of documents. In other words, this kind of reference cannot be used for discerning whether or not documents are biased and distorted. It seems that the

students who answered Type-1 did not have any idea what kind of information should be examined for evaluating the credibility.

2) Type-2: This type of student answered by reference to what they regarded as a general concept or belief without considering the given specific information about the writers and the situation (Lee, 1978). The concepts regarded conventional elements as an important thing. From the general concepts, the students who answered this type deduced evaluation of credibility of documents. For example, among the answers to Question-2, one student regarded the king as the ultimate authority. Therefore, the student believed that generally retainers should follow a king's order. Based on this belief he answered, "If the retainer does not follow the king' order, he would be punished. To deceive a king is the same thing as to reject order of a king. Therefore, he might not deceive the king. *Kim*'s description is more credible." Another answer to Question-2 was "because generally native people know much more about domestic affairs than foreigners." The answer focused on the writer of Document-3 as a foreigner but the event as a domestic affair. So the student who answered above solved the problem by reference to the concept of such a situation that native people know more about a domestic affair than foreigners. One answer to Question-1 was "Because murderers do not usually tell the truth, ...", the student who answered above based on what he regarded general belief that someone who would commit murder could not tell the truth. One student answered Question-3 according to the general concept of historian's work (Shemilt, 1987). The answer was, "because a historian must write the document with adequately examining the relevant materials, ..." To understand historical documents, it is necessary to depend on a general concept or belief concerning personalities and situations. However, most of all, we should think of contents of documents in the specific

context - the so-called historical particularity. Even though the students who answered Type-2 examined the information of writers, they understood by depending on general concepts and belief systems without considering the specific context of the event.

3) Type-3: This type of student answered by reference to the specific information of the writers and documents (Lee, 1978). For example, one answer to Question-2 was "*Kim Ok-kyun* was the agent to intend the reform, whereas *Moellendorff* was the adviser recommended by China. Therefore, both documents must have been biased." We can see that the student who answered above recognized that the political situations of both writers were so contradictory that their writings might be biased. In the following example, one student recognized the nature of a historian's writing. The students' answer to Question-3 was "because the historian's writing has included his interpretation about the reform clauses, ..."

Types of Document Inference

This paper divides the students' answers concerning the inference into four types according to how they used documents involved for the inference. We can identify their attitudes toward the treatment of documents.

1) Type-a: In this type, though the students answered based on the given information in the text, their answers were a little different from that. For example, one answer to Question-4 was "the agents worried about Korea becoming a colony of Japan..." However, in the documents, what the agents worried about was not Korea becoming a colony of Japan but of China. The student who answered above confused the thought of the agents. He misconstrued it in elementary ways (Dickinson & Lee, 1978, p.102). When the students who answered Type-a

read the text, they appeared to neglect the proper attention to the given information.

2) Type-b: In this type, the students did not use the relevant documents to the questions, even though the text limited the relevant documents to the question. Based on their own speculations or irrelevant documents, they solved the problems. So, the students who answered type-b did not understand the action and intention of the agent in the documents. For example, one student answered Question-4 based on his own interpretation. The answer was "*Kim Ok-kyun* intended Korea to become a colony of Japan for his own private interests." However, Document-6 and Document-7 did not imply the agents' thoughts about private interests. Question-5 was concerned with the means that agents used in the event. One answer to Question-5 was "...they were planing to kill the king..." However, in the documents, this kind of plan was never expressed or implied. Some students answered that the means were "conversation," or "persuasion." Strictly speaking, these were not means in the event, but trials to accomplish the agents' intentions before the event. Because the trials did not succeed, the agents had no choice but bring about the event as they had planned. It seems that the students who answered Type-b did not examine what each document contained. As a result, they did not select the documents related to the questions.

In both cases of Question-4 and 5, the answers to which we need to pay more attention were found. These questions were concerned with what the agents did and why. However, some students did not mention what and why. Instead, they wrote just their interpretation using moral judgement or general concept. For example, one answer was, "It was wrong that the agents killed too many people in the process of the event. That was their fault. If they intended to reform by a legitimate means, they might have succeeded." The student who answered above

confused in differentiating the historian's view from the agent's view of the situation (Lee, 1978, p.86). The above example implies that it is necessary for history teachers to teach students how to distinguish between the agent's view and historian's view of the situation.

3) Type-c: In this type, although the students chose the relevant documents to the questions, they used the documents fragmentarily so that they could not understand all aspects of the event. Question-4 was related to what *Kim Ok-kyun*'s intention to plan the event is. Concerning this question, students should point out the two aspects of Kim's intention. One intention was the independence of Korea from the intervention of China. The other was the modern reform of traditional Korea. However, the students who answered Type-3 did not understand these two aspects, and consequently, considered only one aspect of the situation. They answered either "in order to build a modern Nation-State," or "in order to get back the sovereignty from China." The same pattern was found in the answers of Question-5. Question-5 was presented to causally infer what means the agents used in the event and why they did so. However, there were some students who just answered about what means, or just answered why. They did not examine all documents enough to understand all aspects of the event. The students who answered Type-c seemed to answer partially what they found at once.

4) Type-d: In this type, the students were able to understand and infer from the relevant documents by thoroughly examining diverse aspects of the event. For example, one answer to Question-4 was "*Kim* wanted his country to be independent from China, and to build a modern nation." In the following example, we find the answer which used all of the documents relevant to the question. "*Kim* and his followers killed their opponents by taking advantage of the opening ceremony of Korea Ministry of Communication. They posted the letter which was

written by *Kim*, not by the Korean king, to the Japanese troops for requesting their support. The reasons *Kim* used this means were as follows: First, the king did not believe him. Second, the queen believed only the Conservative Party. Third, China had the right of intervention. He and his followers needed power in order to obtain independence from China, and to create modern reform. Therefore, they had to ask for help from the Japanese troops."

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOURCE MATERIAL STUDIES

Problems of Students' Historical thinking

The previous research of source material studies has pointed out the overt contents that students should work with. For example, it has suggested that students should engage in such activities as evaluation, interpretation, synthesis, and discussion concerning source materials. However, the research has not considered what covert factors prevent students from understanding source materials. it has not suggested what students should learn in order to improve their historical thinking. In this respect, this paper is a contribution to Source Material Studies. This paper identifies some types of students' historical thinking in understanding documents. Based on these types, this paper indicates what problems students have in understanding documents and why they have these problems.

Their problems of understanding documents are summarized as follows: 1) Some of the students mentioned out-of-text information from the text. 2) Some of the students answered by reference to their arbitrary interpretation without examining the given information. The answers were not reasonable. 3) Some of the students understood and evaluated the documents by

reference to general concepts of the situations. They did not understand the situation of the event in the specific context. 4) Some of the students did not use the involved documents for inference, but just tried to speculate on the situation. Some of them only used a portion of the documents related to the questions so that they could not thoroughly understand all the aspects of the event, or find out any causalities among the documents.

These problems indicate some important implications. Unless students learn how to deal with historical documents, and how to understand within a historical context, they might misunderstand not only the contents of documents but also historical facts and history itself. Therefore, without teaching the method of historical thinking and historical inquiry, History teachers could not expect successful performance from students in understanding documents. Positive teaching is required to achieve all this, for the students who did not know about historical inquiry could not be presented with documents and be expected intuitively to ask the right kind of questions and find appropriate answers. Teaching historical thinking and historical inquiry is a goal as well as a means of teaching History. Historical thinking and inquiry can make students deeply understand the nature of historical source materials and written history.

Implications for Teaching

We identified that the same class consisted of diverse students who had different types of historical thinking. Some students would solve the problems by inadequate references. Some students would have troubles in dealing with source materials. Therefore, in order to satisfy all students' needs, it is necessary to design Source Material Studies specifically. Most of all, we

should carefully choose proper contents for the students who have not performed with source materials. In my opinion, the contents should involve organizing particular concepts and skills that help students understand history through source materials. This study presents such concepts and skills as follows.

First, students should be able to identify and summarize the contents of documents. When students read source materials, teachers can help students identify the given information by asking question that progress from the simplest information to the more complex information (Edward, 1972). So, the teachers can identify whether the students reach the correct information in the given documents. At the same time, the students can learn how to adjust their fallacious preconceptions.

Second, students should be able to distinguish between statements of facts and opinions, to identify the contradictory records among the documents, and to interpret distorted records (Kang, 1975). These skills are concerned with the evaluation of the credibility of documents. Teachers can organize questions concerning what has to be examined for evaluating documents, and begin with asking those questions to students. In the process of the teacher's asking and students' answering, teachers help students recognize their mistakes in evaluating documents, so that students can find what they should critically examine in evaluating the documents; the characteristics of documents, the information of writers, and the time of the documents' writing.

Third, students should be able to distinguish between understanding the event based on general concepts and on the specific context of an event. That is, to examine historical topics in the historical context. Teachers can provide students with different opportunities to think about the same actions which can be interpreted in different ways. For example, in the case of a man who

commits murder, he should be called a murderer from the viewpoint of ethics or natural law. In the historical context, however, the man could be called a patriot. Teachers can ask students to think of the interpretative differences of this example. Teachers need to lead students to infer the reason the man commits murder in a particular context, and assist students in finding out the conflict between ethical and historical values.

Fourth, students should be able to distinguish between historian's view and agent's view's of the situation (Dickinson & Lee, 1978). Students should interpret an event from their own standpoint. That is historian's view. However, students should also understand agent's view of the situation in the documents before interpretation. Teachers can present students with questions in two ways simultaneously in order to distinguish between the two views. On the one hand, teachers ask how the agents acted in the particular situation. On the other hand, teachers ask how students might act if they were in the same situation. The students have opportunities to think about the differences between the two questions.

Fifth, students should be able to recognize that inferences would be based on relevant source materials (Edward, 1972). That is, they need to distinguish between speculations and reasoned inference based on source materials. For inference from documents, it is helpful to assume some questions about what students should consider: the goal of an agent's action, an agent's judgement of the situation with which he thought himself to be faced, an agent's assumption of the result of his action. Students find the answers to their assumed questions in documents so that they can think about an event from diverse aspects.

In Source Material Studies, what and how students learn should be based on what they learned

in previous studies. In the early learning stages, teachers should concretely organize questions and procedures to indicate what is to be examined. In the most advanced stages, students choose their topics and source materials related to their topics so that they can investigate the problems by themselves without the teacher's help.

Bibliography (in English)

Bamford, Peter (1970), "Original Sources in the Classroom," in Martin Ballard, eds., *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press)

Barcan, Alan (1971), "The New Secondary School Curriculum," in *Social Science, History and the New Curriculum* (Sydney: Hicks Smith and Sons for Workers Educational Association of N.S.W.)

Blyth, J.E. (1982), "Sources and Resources," in *History in Primary Schools* (London: McGraw-Hill)

Burston, W.H. & D. Thomson, eds. (1967), *Studies in the Nature and Teaching History* (Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Burston, W.H. (1972), "Historical Events and the Problem of Teaching Them," in *Principle of History Teaching* (London: Methuen Educational Ltd.)

Cander, Norman F. & Richard I. Schneider (1967), *How to study History* (Thomas Y. Crowell Company)

Cha, Hasoon (1988), *The Nature and Understanding of History (in Korean)*, (Seoul: Hakyunsa)

Chaffer, J. & L. Taylor (1975), "Evidence and Enquiry: The Role of Resource," in *History and The History Teacher* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.)

Coltham, J.B. & J.Fines (1971), *Educational Objectives for the Study of History* (London: The Historical Association)

Commager, H. S. (1967), "The Nature of History," *in The Nature and The Study of History* (Columbus: Charles E. Merill Book, Inc.)

Daniels, R.V. (1972), "The Uses of History," in *Studying History: How and Why* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall)

Dickinson, A. K. & P. J. Lee, eds. (1978), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (London: Heinemann Educational Books)

Dickinson, K., P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers, eds. (1984), *Learning History* (London: Heinemann Educational Books)

Dray, W.H. (1970), *Laws and Explanation in history* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Edwards, A. D. (1972), "Source Material in the Classroom," in W. H. Burston & C. W. Green, eds., *Handbook for History Teachers* (London: Methuen Educational Ltd.)

Elliot, D. M. (1980), *Testing Skills in History* (Dalkeith)

Fines, J. (1987), *Source-Based Questions at a Level* (The Historical Association TH54)

Fitzgerald, James (1983), "History in Curriculum: Debate on Aims and Values," in *History and Theory*, 22(4).

Fry, Heather (1991), *Using Evidence in The GCSE History Classroom* (London: The Historical Association TH63)

Gravy, Brian & Mary Krug (1977), *Models of History Teaching in the Secondary School* (Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd)

Hempel, C. G. (1957), "The Function of General Laws in History," in P. Gardiner, ed., *Theories of History* (New York: The Free Press)

Hempel, C. G. (1966), "Explanation in Science and in History," in W. H. Dray, ed., *Philosophical Analysis and History* (New York: Harper & Row, Publisher)

Kang, Woochul (1975), *Historiography and Its Educational Approaches (in Korean)*, (Seoul: Tamgoodang)

Kent, Sherman (1942), *Writing History* (N.Y.F.S. Crafts & Co.)

Lee, P. J. (1983), "History Teaching and Philosophy of History," in *History and Theory*, 22(4).

Lomas, Tim (1990), *Evidence* (London: The Historical Association, TH63)

Nicholas, E. T. & D. Thompson (1972), "Method of Teaching History : A survey," in W. H. Burston & C. W. Green, eds., *Handbook for History Teachers* (London: Methuen Educational Ltd.)

Palmer, M & G. R. Batho (1981), *The Source Method in History Teaching* (London: The Historical Association, TH48)

Partington, G. (1980), "Why Teach History in Schools," in *The Idea of Historical Education* (Oxford: NFER Publishing Co.)

Peel, E. A. (1967), "Some Problem in Psychology of History Teaching," in W. H. Burston & D. Thomson, eds., *Studies in the Nature and Teaching History* (Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Randell, Keith (1976), *Resources for the Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (London: The Historical Association)

Rogers, R. J. (1987), "History: The Past as a Frame of Reference," in Christopher Portal, ed., *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (London: The Falmer Press)

Rogers, R. J. (1987), *History: Why, What & How?* (London: The Historical Association)

Rogers, R. J. (1979), *The New History: Theory and Practice* (London: The Historical Association)

Shemilt, Denis (1987), "Adolescent Ideas About Evidence and Methodology in History," in C. Portal, ed., *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (London: The Falmer Press)

Tate, Nicholas (1987), *GCSE Course work: History A teacher's guide to Organization and Assessment* (London: MacMilian Education Ltd.)

Bibliography (in Korean)

1. Government Publications

고등학교 국사과 교육과정 해설 (문교부 고시 제88-7호, 1988)
국민학교 교육과정 해설 (문교부 고시 제87-9호, 1987)
국사편찬위원회, "국사교육의 기본적 방향" 『국사교사용지도서』 (문교부, 1990)
제6차 고등학교 교육과정 (문교부 고시 제1992-19호, 1992)
제6차 국민학교 교육과정(문교부 고시 제1992-16호, 1992)
제6차 중학교 교육과정 (문교부 고시 제1992-11호, 1992)
중학교 국사과 교육과정 해설 (문교부 고시 제87-7호, 1987)
한국교육개발원, "역사교육의 목적과 방향" 『사회과교사용지도서』 (문교부, 1990)

2. Books

건국대학교 출판부(편), 『갑신일록』 (평민사, 1978)
드레이, W., (황문수 역), 『역사철학』 (문예출판사, 1990)
멜렌도르프 부인, (신복룡, 김운경 역) 『멜렌도르프문서』 (평민사, 19787)
민태원, 『갑신정변과 김옥균』 (국제문화협회간, 1947)
박성수, 『역사학개론』 (삼영사, 1977)
베른하임, E., (박광순 역), 『역사학 입문』 (범우사, 1985)
변태섭, 『한국사 통론』 (삼영사, 1986)
양병우, 『역사의 방법』 (민음사, 1988)
이광린, 『개화당 연구』 (일조각, 1974)
이원순(외), 『역사교육론』, 삼영사, 1980.
차하순, 『역사의 본질과 인식』 (학연사, 1988)
켄트, S, (안정모 역), 『역사학연구법 - 논문의 구성과 서술』 (성문각, 1988)
켄더, F./리차드 I.슈나이더, (김성남 역) 『역사를 어떻게 연구할 것인가』 (청아출판사, 1986)
콜링우드, R.G., (소광희/손동현 역), 『역사의 인식 - 역사학은 과학인가 이념인가』 (경문사)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

트라우브, J.C/파울 키른, (한기영 역), 『역사학입문』 (정음사,1990)

3. Articles

강우철, "**歷史學習指導 方法의 探索**" 『**社會科敎育**』 8, 1975.
_____, "사료학습", 『역사의 교육』 (교학사, 1974)
_____, "역사적 탐구능력의 특성" 『사회과교육』 7, 1974.
_____, 『역사연구방법과 그 교육적 접근』, (탐구당, 1975)
김 철, "**歷史學習과 補助資料 活用 問題 - 특히 史料를 中心으로 하여-**", 『**歷史敎育**』 4, 1959.
김순권, "**歷史敎育: 國史 探究學習 資料의 開發과 適用**", 『釜山敎育』 227, 1983.6.
김한종,"역사적 사고력의 개념과 그 교육적 의미", 『이원순교수 정년기념 역사학논총』 (교학사, 1991)
박종하, "고등학교 국사교육에 있어서 사료이용에 관한 일 연구" 『역사교육논집』 10, 1987.
서원일, "**國史敎育을 위한 史料學習 硏究**" 『**歷史敎育**』 26, 1979.
송춘영, "**歷史的 思考力 伸張을 위한 史料活用 方案**" 『**李元淳敎授華甲記念史學論叢**』, 1986.
신국주, "갑신정변에 대한 재평가", 한국정치외교사학회(편) 『갑신정변 연구』 (명민사, 1985)
윤세철, "**國史敎育資料 및 學習指導 問題**", 『**歷史敎育**』 28, 1980.
_____, "사회과 교육통합의 본질" 역사교육연구회 특별발표회: 소위 사회과 교육통합의 문제와 역사교육의 진로,『역사교육』 50, 1991.
한국역사연구회(편), "세계 각국의 역사교육 동향 I" 『역사와 현실』 제7호 (역사비평사, 1992)
한상준, "국사교육에 있어서 사료학습의 접근방법", 『경북사대교육연구지』 22, 1980.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix

This test intends to survey students' historical thinking. After reading the documents from Document-1 to Document-7 thoroughly, write your answers to the following questions in detail.

Introduction

The following documents are related to the *Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun*. This event took place from December 4 to 6, in 1884. *"Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun"* was the event whereby the members of the "*Kae-Hwa Party*," including *Kim Ok-Kyun, Pak Young-hyo, Hong Young-sik* attempted to take power by taking advantage of the opening ceremony of the Korean Ministry of Communication. They attacked the Korean king's palace accompanied by 50 Korean military cadets and 200 Japanese solders. They escorted the king and the queen from the palace. They killed some government officials who supported the queen's followers. The *Kae-Hwa Party*, which took power, organized a new cabinet. They presented the reform bill composed of 14 clauses. However, the Chinese troops moved in and intervened. Therefore, some *Kae-Hwa Party* members, such as *Kim Ok-kyun and Pak Young-hyo*, had to seek asylum in Japan. Other members of the Party were punished with death. The attempted ended in failure.

Document

Document-1: This was excerpted from *Pak Young-hyo*'s conversation with a Japanese chief clerk on November 4, 1884.

"...I said to the king, 'The danger is near. If we do not declare independence of *Chosun* (traditional Korea), or if we do not change our political systems, it is easy to predict that our country will be a colony of the other countries.' However, the Conservative Party is a majority whereas my party is a minority. On the one hand, the king partially believes us.

On the other hand, he would not believe us. The queen mainly follows the opinion of the Conservative Party. She urges the king to believe the Conservative Party. The king is changing his mind gradually, and so would not listen to our patriotic advice."

Document-2: This was excerpted from *Kap-Shin Diary* written by *Kim Ok-kyun,* several years after seeking asylum in Japan. It was written about what happened on December 4, 1884.

"I said to the king, 'If we ask the Japanese troops to guard us, we can be safe.' The king told me to ask the Japanese troops. However, the king told me, 'If we ask the Japanese troops to guard, how will the Chinese troops respond ?' I answered, 'It will be better that we also ask the Chinese troops to guard us.' I said to *Yun Sae-hyun,* 'If you go to the Japanese legation, and bring the Japanese officer to the palace, you can gain credit. I also sent someone to the Chinese camp to ask them to come and to guard us (Of course, it was a lie. I have already conspired with him). I said to the king, 'In spite of asking the Japanese troops, I think they would not come here, unless you write a letter to ask the troops.' The king said to me, 'What should I do?' I gave the king a pencil, and *Pak* gave the king a paper. Then, the king wrote on the paper by himself, 'Japanese minister! Come and guard me.'"

Document-3: This was excerpted from the Diary of *Mrs. Moellendorff* in *The Documents of Moellendorff* edited by *Mrs. Moellendorff* in 1930. *Moellendorff* was a diplomatic adviser who was recommended by China, in the period of the event.

"The rebels ran to and told the king that someone had raised a rebellion. Therefore, the king should hide himself, and ask the Japanese troops to guard him. The king rejected their advice. The rebels sent a letter which *Kim Ok-kyun* wrote 'Japanese minister! Come and guard me' to the Japanese legation."

Document-4: This was excerpted from the reform bill which is contained in *Kap-Shin Diary*, which was written by *Kim Ok-kyun*, several years after the event.

Clause 1: We shall not pay tribute to China any more.

Clause 2: We shall repeal the caste system and establish the new law for the right of equal people. We enlist government officials based on their merits.

Clause 3: We shall reform land and tax laws, and force villainous retainers out. We shall help poor people, and save the money for the national finance.

Clause 12: The Minister of Finance only has the right of managing the national finance. The other Offices of Finance will be abolished.

Document-5: This was excerpted from a book related to *Kap-Shin- Chung-Byun* written by a historian in 1973.

"Clause-1 indicates the ideals of the *Kae-Hwa Party* to cut the traditional ties with China, and their argument for independence. Clause-2 indicates their belief that only when the *Yang-Ban* system (the traditional Korean caste system) was abolished, could the country prosper. One of their ideals was to establish a modern nation-state. Clause-3 indicates their intention to reform the land system and tax system which had been serious problems for a long time. Clause- 12 may be included in the reform bill, because their advice concerning the Offices of Finance being united together had not been approved. This clause indicates that the idea of the *Kae-Hwa Party* was the same that of the other Korean enlightenment leaders who wanted to create a rich and strong country."

Document-6: This was excerpted from Kim *Ok-kyun*'s argument, which was from a conversation between *Kim Ok-kyun* and the king on October 12, 1884.

"There are too many problems in our government. There are too many villainous retainers who keep the king blind. Only those who offer a bribe to China can take power. Therefore, it follows that changes should be urgently made. First, we should reform the domestic systems to create a strong nation. Second, we should declare the independence of our country. Third, we should receive new knowledge from the other modern nation- states."

Document-7: This was excerpted from *Reminiscence of Kap-Shin-Chung-Byun,* written by

Seo Jae-pil, who participated in the event as a military cadet.

"*Kim Ok-kyun* could not stand the humiliation of China's intervention in the sovereignty over his country. He always worried about how his country could be independent among countries. He had never received modern Western-style education. However, he understood modern policies and foreign affairs. He wanted to make his country be a strong modern nation-state. Therefore, he concluded that his country should introduce new knowledge and technology of Western countries. He also concluded that his country should abolish old conventions inherited by government and society. He understood that it took several hundred years for European countries to be enlightened because they had to compete with each other. However, he thought that it did not take too much time for Japan to be enlightened. Therefore, he thought the Japanese case could be a model for Korean reform."

Question

Question-1: Do you believe whether *Pak* told the truth or not in Document-1? Choose your answer among the following, and write in detail why you believe so.

a) He told the truth.

b) He did not tell the truth.

c) It can not be judged whether he told the truth or not. Further documentation is needed.

Question-2: Document-2 and Document-3 are descriptions about the situation of the event. Answer Question-I and Question-II.

I. Are there any differences between the description of *Kim* (Document-2) and that of *Mrs. Moellendorff* (Document-3)? If any, what are the differences? Why do you think they exist?

II. If you want to understand the situation precisely, which document is more credible, in your opinion, to understand the situation? Select your answer among the following, and

write in detail why you think so.

a) Document-2 is more credible than Document-3.

b) Document-3 is more credible than Document-2.

c) Both documents are credible.

d) Neither document is credible.

e) In order to judge which is more credible, further documentation is needed.

Question-3: Document-4 and Document-5 are related to the reform bill. Answer Question-I and Question-II.

I. Are there any differences between Document-5 and Document-6? If any, what are the differences, and why do you think they exist?

II. If you want to understand precisely what reform the agents intended to pursue, which document is more credible? Select your answer from the following, and write in detail why you think so.

a) Document-4 is more credible than Document-5.

b) Document-5 is more credible than Document-4.

c) Both documents are credible.

d) Neither document is credible.

e) In order to judge which is more credible, further documentation is needed.

Question-4: What were the intentions of *Kim Ok-kyun* to bring about the event in Document-6 and Document-7?

Question-5: What kind of means did *Kim Ok-kyun* and *Pak Young-hyo* use for accomplishing their intentions in the event, and why did they use those means? Answer the question by using all of the documents presented (from Document-1 to 7).